

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. Claims 13-20 have been withdrawn from consideration. New claim 23 has been added.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

(a) Claims 1, 2, and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Koay et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0047130A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Koay discloses, in Fig. 2, an LED package 2 having a planar substrate 210 having a recess 260 on an upper surface thereof, an LED die 230 disposed on a circular floor 222 formed at a bottom of the recess 260. The side wall of the recess is plated with a metallic layer presenting a silvered reflective surface to the light emitting diode.

In Koay, however, the metallic layer (corresponds to the “reflector” of the present invention) terminates at an uppermost surface of the planar substrate 210 and does not extend “beyond an uppermost surface of the circuit board.”

Accordingly, Koay fails to disclose or suggest the “reflector” as recited in claim 1.

Claims 2 and 5, dependent on claim 1, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 1.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(b) Claims 1, 6, and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Reisenauer et al. (USP 6,161,910). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1

Reisenauer discloses, in Figs. 2 and 3, an LED reading light having a plurality of LED's 26 mounted on an outward facing side 24 of an LED circuit board 22 mounted on a housing 16, and an external cylinder 25 mounted to the housing 16. Reisenauer also states that a reflective white solder mask coating is applied to the outward facing side 24 of the LED circuit board 22.

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that the external cylinder 25 of Reisenauer corresponds to the "reflector" of the present invention.

Applicants respectfully submit, however, that, as stated above, the external cylinder 25 is mounted to the housing 16 and is not "mounted directly on said circuit board" as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Reisenauer fails to disclose or suggest the "reflector" as recited in claim 1.

Independent Claim 6

Claim 6 is allowable at least for the similar reasons as stated in the foregoing with respect to claim 1.

Further, in page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that "it is inherent that the inner surface of the external cylinder (25) is a reflecting surface" because all materials have light reflecting properties.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's allegation because not all materials have light reflecting properties, and even assuming that all materials have some light reflecting

properties, the lighting apparatus of the present invention, which includes a reflector having an “internal reflective surface” is intended to reflect as much light generated by an LED as possible so that it can be used, for example, with a camera.

Reisenauer, however, fails to disclose or suggest that the external cylinder 25 has such propensity.

Moreover, even assuming that the inner surface of the cylinder 25 reflects light generated by the LED's, the light would merely reflect back to the LED's (in a direction parallel to the LED circuit board 22) because the inner surface extends in a direction parallel to a center axis of the external cylinder 25.

Accordingly, Reisenauer does not reflect light “away from the circuit board” as recited in claim 6.

Claim 10, dependent on claim 6, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 6.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

(a) Claims 3, 4, 11, and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koay in view of Kitano et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0216151A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3, 4, 11, and 12, dependent on claim 1, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 1.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(b) Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reisenauer in view of McDermott (USP 4,947,291). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7, dependent on claim 6, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 6.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(c) Claims 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reisenauer in view of Sommers (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0180037A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 8 and 9, dependent on claim 6, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 6.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(d) Claim 21 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reisenauer in view of Baliozian (USP 58,161,871). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 21, dependent on claim 1, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 1.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

New Claim

New claim 23 is allowable at least for the similar reasons as stated in the foregoing with regard to claim 1.

A favorable determination by the Examiner and allowance of this claim is earnestly solicited.

Application No.: 10/759,421
Reply dated April 12, 2006
Reply to Office Action of January 12, 2006
Page 12 of 12

Docket No.: 0879-0425P

Conclusion

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims in the present application are respectfully requested.


The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Reply After Final in that it raises no new issues. Alternatively, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Reply After Final in that it places the application in better form for Appeal.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Maki Hatsumi (#40,417) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: April 12, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Michael R. Cammarata, Reg. No.: 39,491
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant